Enterprise Target State Visioning

Date: October 28, 2003
Time: 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Location: 820 WDCUCP Room 221 B&C

I Objectives:

- Review/Validate Technical Strategies Target Vision High Level Diagram
- Review/Validate To-Be Business Entity Flow Diagrams
- Place any key issues into the 'parking lot'

II Agenda

1:00 Technical Strategies Target Vision High Level Diagram Review
2:30 To-Be Business Entity Flow Diagrams

III Participants:

Name	E-Mail	Phone
Paul Hill	Paul.hill.jr@ed.gov	202.377.4323
Keith Wilson	Keith.Wilson@ed.gov	202.377.3591
Roger Hartmuller	Roger.l.hartmuller@accenture.com	202.962.4160
Nate Brown	Nathan.r.brown@accenture.com	202.962.0868
Carol Seifert	Carolyn.Seifert@ed.gov	202.377.3506
Jane Holman	Jane.Holman@ed.gov	202.377.4322
Denise Hill	Denise.Hill@ed.gov	202.377.3030
Jeanne Saunders	Jeanne.Saunders@ed.gov	202.377.3246
Chris Merrill	Chris.m.merrill@accenture.com	202.962.0895
Jay Hurt	John.Hurt@ed.gov	202.260.0584
Matt Fontana	Matteo.Fontana@ed.gov	202.377.3005
Cyndi Reynolds	Cyndi.Reynolds@ed.gov	202.377.4046
Michele Brown	Michele.Brown@ed.gov	202.377.3023
Kelly Tate	Kelly.f.tate@accenture.com	202.962.0633
Terry Woods	Terry.Woods@ed.gov	202.377.3023
Kyle Michl	Kyle.a.michl@accenture.com	202.962.0750
Holly Hyland	Holly.Hyland@ed.gov	202.377.3710
David Marker	David.r.marker@accenture.com	202.962.0664

IV Summary:

- The Technical Strategies' FSA Target Conceptual Architecture was reviewed. All comments and feedback were used to update the diagram. The final diagram will be available as part of Deliverable 123.1.12 – Technology Vision and Strategic Plan.
- The School and Direct Loan Business Entity Flows were reviewed. All comments and feedback were used to update the diagrams. Attached are the updated versions of the diagrams for further review.

V   Parking Lot:

- Knowledge based data (dear colleague, "non-data info") needs to be further addressed. Are "cubes" within the data warehouse/marts sufficient to illustrate the point
- Need to revisit eCmo data management requirements.
- "Individual User" access management (customer access)
- Centralized governance approach – FSA discussion
- Should we continue to pass all "O&D" financial transactions from GAPS through FMS? How could this be done otherwise? How does this impact the PPM Business Capability Area?

VI   Discussion Points:

- Technical Strategies Target Vision High Level Diagram Review

  - Initially the group walked through the steps from the previous Data Strategy Retreats that were used for arriving at the target state vision (Note: Meeting Minutes from the previous two Data Strategy retreats were distributed by email to all participants; they can also be found in the 123.1.4 Data Framework Specification Deliverable appendix).

  - The Technical Strategies Target Conceptual Diagram uses the To-Be Financial Aid Life Cycle Diagram as a baseline. The Technical Strategies Conceptual Diagram shows the To-Be vision from a more technical perspective. The group began reviewing the diagram starting in the middle data store box and moved outward, discussing the various layers.

  - As part of the central data repository, the metadata repository was noted as a new bucket depicted as part of the technical view of the target state vision (this data being where the standards and explanations of data fields are found). In response to a question, it was verified that the metadata is both data standards and process standards.

  - There was some confusion as to why the Enterprise Shared Functions were listed separately from the blue box items in the Integration Services layer. Furthermore, some of the group initially did not understand why some of the integration items were listed both in the gray integration layer and in the FSA Gateway box. It was pointed out that the duplication of items in the Gateway and the Integration Services Layer was to show that services are made available to the external community via the Gateway, but it was agreed that pictorially it was somewhat confusing and the integration items could be better illustrated.

  - In response to a question, it was noted that "Capability Discovery" (item in the Integration Services Layer) is where you have a directory of services and where you would find out how to interface with FSA.

o A question arose as to whether the list of Enterprise Shared Functions was complete. The group agreed that the list only contained functions identified to-date and that additional ESFs could be identified in the future.

o The "Data Tracing and Visibility" integration service was defined as being services which allow the business owners to know where the life-cycle processing is occurring and whether it is successful. The service could also allow users to find how many records are in each stage of the business process. This capability should also be accessible via the FSA Gateway with the understanding that it would be limited access provided to the external partners.

o The group agreed that not all external partners go through an "internet cloud" to interface with FSA (e.g., some GAs have a direct feed into FSA). However, it was suggested that there be indication that some systems do go through the "internet cloud" to get the FSA Gateway.

o It was note that Web Services needs to be added as an Integration Service either in the Web Access box or in the Integration Services layer.

o It was agreed that the Enterprise Analytics and Research Green Box should remain in the security layer but should move outside of the Common Data Architecture; having the Green box inside loses the concept that it has business functions and is not just tools. The tools used by EA&R would remain inside the CDA as "Analytics and Research Tools".

o While reviewing the tools used by EA&R, it was suggested that "Enterprise Content Management" may not be accurately depicted as part of the data repositories and that another repository (yellow cylinder) may need to be added. Items were added to the parking lot noting that concept of "cubes" in the data warehouse may not be enough to illustrate knowledge management data and noting that eCMO data requirements need to be further researched.

o Some of the participants felt the Access Management (brown layer) does not accurately depict the fact that it is system access management, borrower user access management, and trading partner and internal access management.

o The security layer (blue) was defined as a mechanism for approving or authenticating before giving access and was determined to have both physical and software components.

o It was agreed that the ED/FSA Internal Users should be depicted as being outside of the security layer and coming in through the access management layer.

- o It was pointed out that the student access management goes through the web access box. The students are able to view their data without going through a business capability area (green box).

- o While the illustration may infer that students and trading partner individuals are managed at the same level, the group agreed that this issue still needs to be further researched and addressed.

- o It was noted that in addition to the access management layer (brown layer) the business capability areas (green boxes) could have another lower-level of access management.

- To-Be Business Entity Flow Diagrams Review

  - o School Business Entity Flow Suggested Revisions

    The "FISAP" needs to be mentioned as being used by schools for Campus Based Funding application

    There should be mention in the Entity Flow to the fact that the Federal School Code may be updated on an annual basis based on enrollment changes.

    It was agreed that O&D, rather than TPM, should establish initial funding levels for Direct Loans and Pell Grants.

    It was noted that in the To-Be O&D should not have the ability to modify any school demographic fields; all updates should be routed through TPM.

    In the Origination and Disbursement process step it was suggested that there be reference to the maintenance processes (i.e., COA updates) which may have an effect on funding.

    There needs to be an overriding paragraph in the "oversight" box that focuses on the TPM's oversight core processes.

    It was pointed out that ACA payments are not invoices but are monies in GAPS that the schools are able to drawdown.

  - o Direct Loan/Pell Grant Business Entity Flow Suggested Revisions

    In addition to the Common Record being sent via the FSA Gateway, there needs to be reference in the Delivery O&D box to the schools' capability to submit individual updates via the web.

It was noted that reference to O&D processing paper promissory notes should be removed. O&D processes only electronic MPNs (either an electronic signature or an imaged paper note).

O&D should trigger the push of data from the CDA to CSB, rather than CSB retrieving the data.